Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2012/05/31 : CIA-RDP78-03642A001300010041-1

## CONFIDENTIAL

SUBJECT: Visit to	on Portable Hydrogen Generator
1. On 29 Am	ril 1958 the undersigned met with
	of
	for the purpose of re-
Arearug brogress on	the portable hydrogen generator.
	run five additional tests since the time of the
	which were reported on in the monthly report for gned questioned them on the failure of some of the
	especially with regard to generation time at various
catalyst concentrat	
	rather that the number of tests were too small to e conclusions. On the other hand, has been
selectively choosin	g those test results which did confirm their ideas on
the theoretical beh tests were small.	avior of the generator and here also the number of
-	
3	had just completed three 1/10 scale runs with the gener- pool temperature of 47°F at catalyst (CsCl2) concentra-
tions varying from	4.20 to 5.56 pounds. The tests were run with the
generator floating	in a tank of water (previous tests had all been run
temperature resulte	resting on the floor) and a significantly lower final due to dissapation of heat through the fabric to the
Attended to Alman and Alman	
	t a higher rate than on previous runs. The total
generation time on	these three runs varied from 34 to 59 minutes, the
generation time on time varying invers	these three runs varied from 34 to 59 minutes, the ely with the amount of catalyst used.
generation time on time varying inverse 4. As pointed	these three runs varied from 34 to 59 minutes, the ely with the amount of catalyst used.  d out during the last visit, the amount of catalyst re-
generation time on time varying inverse 4. As pointed quired is substantic If the 1/10 scale go	these three runs varied from 34 to 59 minutes, the ely with the amount of catalyst used.  d out during the last visit, the amount of catalyst really greater than was predicted at the end of Phase 1. eneration scales directly, the amount of catalyst re-
4. As pointed in the substantial of the 1/10 scale grained for the low	these three runs varied from 34 to 59 minutes, the ely with the amount of catalyst used.  d out during the last visit, the amount of catalyst really greater than was predicted at the end of Phase 1. eneration scales directly, the amount of catalyst retemperature (47°F) generation will be about 20 times.
4. As pointed in the substantial of the 1/10 scale granted for the low predicted (i.e., 50	these three runs varied from 34 to 59 minutes, the ely with the amount of catalyst used.  d out during the last visit, the amount of catalyst really greater than was predicted at the end of Phase 1. eneration scales directly, the amount of catalyst re-
4. As pointed quired is substantial of the 1/10 scale grained for the low predicted (i.e., 50 signed, however, the ple of as much as 40	these three runs varied from 34 to 59 minutes, the ely with the amount of catalyst used.  d out during the last visit, the amount of catalyst really greater than was predicted at the end of Phase 1. eneration scales directly, the amount of catalyst retemperature (47°F) generation will be about 20 times to lbs. vs. 2.5 lbs.). It is the opinion of the underat the results will not scale directly and that a multifught be expected. This fails to take into account
4. As pointed in time on time varying inverse 4. As pointed quired is substantially the 1/10 scale granted for the low predicted (i.e., 50 signed, however, the ple of as much as 44 that the relative he	these three runs varied from 34 to 59 minutes, the ely with the amount of catalyst used.  d out during the last visit, the amount of catalyst really greater than was predicted at the end of Phase 1. eneration scales directly, the amount of catalyst retemperature (47°F) generation will be about 20 times to lbs. vs. 2.5 lbs.). It is the opinion of the underat the results will not scale directly and that a multiunish be expected. This fails to take into account eat dissapation from the full scale generator will be
4. As pointed quired is substantial of the 1/10 scale grained for the low predicted (i.e., 50 signed, however, the ple of as much as 44 that the relative heless than in the 1/2 and consequently the	these three runs varied from 34 to 59 minutes, the ely with the amount of catalyst used.  d out during the last visit, the amount of catalyst really greater than was predicted at the end of Phase 1. eneration scales directly, the amount of catalyst retemperature (47°F) generation will be about 20 times to lbs. vs. 2.5 lbs.). It is the opinion of the underat the results will not scale directly and that a multifught be expected. This fails to take into account
4. As pointed in time on time varying inverse the following inverse quired is substantially the 1/10 scale gradied for the low predicted (i.e., 50 signed, however, the ple of as much as that the relative helps than in the 1/2	these three runs varied from 34 to 59 minutes, the ely with the amount of catalyst used.  d out during the last visit, the amount of catalyst really greater than was predicted at the end of Phase 1. eneration scales directly, the amount of catalyst retemperature (47°F) generation will be about 20 times to 1bs. vs. 2.5 lbs.). It is the opinion of the underat the results will not scale directly and that a multi-0 might be expected. This fails to take into account eat dissapation from the full scale generator will be 10 scale runs (simply from surface area considerations)
4. As pointed in a substantial of the 1/10 scale grained for the low predicted (i.e., 50 signed, however, the ple of as much as 40 that the relative he less than in the 1/2 and consequently the suggests.	these three runs varied from 34 to 59 minutes, the ely with the amount of catalyst used.  d out during the last visit, the amount of catalyst really greater than was predicted at the end of Phase 1. eneration scales directly, the amount of catalyst retemperature (47°F) generation will be about 20 times to lbs. vs. 2.5 lbs.). It is the opinion of the underat the results will not scale directly and that a multiought be expected. This fails to take into account eat dissapation from the full scale generator will be 10 scale runs (simply from surface area considerations) e scaling up may not be as severe as the undersigned
4. As pointed quired is substantial of the 1/10 scale grained for the low predicted (i.e., 50 signed, however, the ple of as much as 44 that the relative he less than in the 1/2 and consequently the suggests.  5. In view of placed in the water,	these three runs varied from 34 to 59 minutes, the ely with the amount of catalyst used.  d out during the last visit, the amount of catalyst really greater than was predicted at the end of Phase 1. eneration scales directly, the amount of catalyst retemperature (47°F) generation will be about 20 times 1 lbs. vs. 2.5 lbs.). It is the opinion of the underat the results will not scale directly and that a multiought be expected. This fails to take into account eat dissapation from the full scale generator will be 10 scale runs (simply from surface area considerations) e scaling up may not be as severe as the undersigned for the heat dissapation experience of the generator when believes that a higher berohydride concen-
4. As pointer quired is substantial of the 1/10 scale grained for the low predicted (i.e., 50 signed, however, the ple of as much as 40 that the relative heless than in the 1/2 and consequently the suggests.  5. In view of placed in the water, tration, which means	these three runs varied from 34 to 59 minutes, the ely with the amount of catalyst used.  d out during the last visit, the amount of catalyst really greater than was predicted at the end of Phase 1. eneration scales directly, the amount of catalyst retemperature (47°F) generation will be about 20 times that a substict lbs. vs. 2.5 lbs.). It is the opinion of the underat the results will not scale directly and that a multicular might be expected. This fails to take into account eat dissapation from the full scale generator will be 10 scale runs (simply from surface area considerations) e scaling up may not be as severe as the undersigned of the heat dissapation experience of the generator when believes that a higher borohydride concents a smaller "pool" could be tolerated in the full scale
4. As pointer quired is substantial of the 1/10 scale grained for the low predicted (i.e., 50 signed, however, the ple of as much as 40 that the relative heless than in the 1/2 and consequently the suggests.  5. In view of placed in the water, tration, which means	these three runs varied from 34 to 59 minutes, the ely with the amount of catalyst used.  d out during the last visit, the amount of catalyst really greater than was predicted at the end of Phase 1. eneration scales directly, the amount of catalyst retemperature (47°F) generation will be about 20 times that a substict lbs. vs. 2.5 lbs.). It is the opinion of the underat the results will not scale directly and that a multicular might be expected. This fails to take into account eat dissapation from the full scale generator will be 10 scale runs (simply from surface area considerations) e scaling up may not be as severe as the undersigned of the heat dissapation experience of the generator when believes that a higher borohydride concents a smaller "pool" could be tolerated in the full scale
4. As pointed in time on time varying inverse the varying inverse quired is substantially the 1/10 scale grained for the low predicted (i.e., 50 signed, however, the ple of as much as 44 that the relative he less than in the 1/2 and consequently the suggests.  5. In view of placed in the water, tration, which means the suggests of the placed in the water, tration, which means the suggests.	these three runs varied from 34 to 59 minutes, the ely with the amount of catalyst used.  d out during the last visit, the amount of catalyst really greater than was predicted at the end of Phase 1. eneration scales directly, the amount of catalyst retemperature (47°F) generation will be about 20 times lbs. vs. 2.5 lbs.). It is the opinion of the underat the results will not scale directly and that a multiought be expected. This fails to take into account eat dissapation from the full scale generator will be 10 scale runs (simply from surface area considerations) e scaling up may not be as severe as the undersigned  f the heat dissapation experience of the generator when believes that a higher berohydride concense a smaller "pool" could be tolerated in the full scale  EX CORRECTION — ACCORDING TO COMPARE I RPT, Prunt, or COCL, NEEDED AT T= 40°F (X°C)
generation time on time varying inverse 4. As pointed is substantial of the 1/10 scale grained for the low predicted (i.e., 50 signed, however, the ple of as much as 44 that the relative he less than in the 1/2 and consequently the suggests.  5. In view of placed in the water, tration, which means that the relative he suggests.	these three runs varied from 34 to 59 minutes, the ely with the amount of catalyst used.  d out during the last visit, the amount of catalyst really greater than was predicted at the end of Phase 1. eneration scales directly, the amount of catalyst retemperature (47°F) generation will be about 20 times lbs. vs. 2.5 lbs.). It is the opinion of the underatte results will not scale directly and that a multiought be expected. This fails to take into account eat dissapation from the full scale generator will be 10 scale runs (simply from surface area considerations) e scaling up may not be as severe as the undersigned  If the heat dissapation experience of the generator when believes that a higher berohydride concents a smaller "pool" could be tolerated in the full scale  EX SITES CAUSED AT THE ACCORDING TO CHARGE I RAFT, PAMET. OF COCCAL AUSEDED AT THE ACCORDING TO CHARGE I RAFT, PAMET.

unit. To test out this hypothesis, however, would mean between 10 and 15 additional 1/10 and 1/5 scale tests which would cost about \$12,600 more (not including the cost of the borohydride -- which would amount to about \$5,000). Also, the full scale unit has already been ordered and a cancellation at this time would involve a forfeiture of a part of the price of the unit.

6. As it is, does not have the Phase II program as described and estimate will be required to allow them to complete This \$4500 estimate makes no allowance for	it in a stisfactory manner.	25 <b>X</b> 1
generator for which contigency	would like to allow for by	25X1
asking \$1000 more. The undersigned has ask \$4500 extention proposal.		25 <b>X</b> 1
7. plans to run three more various catalyst concentrations during May. by two 1/5 scale runs, one at 47°F, the oth confirm the 1/10 scale test experience.	. These will be followed up	25 <b>X</b> 1

:mt

## CONFIDENTIAL

